



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

②

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,223	08/29/2001	Mehmet Sayal	10010316-1	8853

7590 10/13/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

KHATRI, ANIL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2191

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/943,223

Applicant(s)

SAYAL ET AL.

Examiner

Anil Khatri

Art Unit

2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Anderson et al* "Workflow Interoperability enabling E Commerce" April 1, 1999, www.wfmc.org taken with "Workflow Management Coalition Interface 1: Process Definition Interchange Process Model" Document no. WfMC TC 1-16P, Author *Work Group 1*, July 15, 1998 (thereafter *Work Group 1*)

Regarding claim 1

Anderson et al teaches,

- receiving a description of a business-to-business interaction standard (page 1, last paragraph, "this definition indicates the most...between organizations);
- converting the description of business-to-business interaction standard to a structured representation of the business-to-business interaction standard (page 2, 2nd paragraph, "business processes... they interoperate);

Art Unit: 2191

- automatically generating at least one process template based on the structured representation of the business-to-business interaction standard (page 2, 1st paragraph, “the implementation of value chain... in operation”). *Anderson et al teaches*, doesn’t teach explicitly using the process template to design a workflow. However *Work Group 1*, teaches (figure 2-1, page 7, item 2.1, 2nd paragraph, “it is the process definition... operation of the process”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to generate template and use in workflow. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine process description with process template in business-to-business environment along with standard to achieve efficiency and enhancing workflow management.

Regarding claims 2 and 13

Anderson et al teaches,

the description of an electronic business-to-business interaction standard includes a description of one of RosettaNet, CBL, EDI, OSI, and cXML (page 2, 1st paragraph, “the implementation of value chain... in operation”).

Regarding claims 3 and 14

Work Group 1 teaches,

the description of the electronic business-to-business interaction standard to a structured representation of the business-to-business interaction standard includes for each state, defining all income transitions and all outgoing transitions (page 34, item 3.3.4, 3rd paragraph, “if there are a multiple incoming and outgoing transaction... activity entity definition”); and

Art Unit: 2191

for each transition, defining a source state and a target state (page 11, item 2.5, 2nd paragraph, “we refer to the following states...during normal execution”, see page 80-81, Annex B).

Regarding claims 4 and 15

Work Group 1 teaches,

representing data in a structured form by employing a mark-up language (pages 8-9, figure 2-1 item 2.3, last paragraph, “as a process definition grammar...”, page 60, see item 4.3 WPDL”).

Regarding claim 5

Work Group 1 teaches,

structured process definition includes structured data and structured data flow (pages 12-13, item 3, last paragraph, “data that is to be...”, see page 73, item 4.3.6”).

Regarding claims 6 and 16

Work Group 1 teaches,

structured process definition includes an XMI that includes at least one XML document (pages 60-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate object oriented document as XML. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine XML or Java for web environment to integrate workflow in electronic environment with different platforms.

Regarding claim 5

Work Group 1 teaches,

The structure process definition includes structured data and structure data flow (see figure 2-1, page 7, 2nd paragraph, “it is the process definition... of the process”).

Regarding claim 7

Anderson et al teaches,

automatically converting the structured data and flow into at least one process template includes automatically converting the structured data and flow into at least one process template that is specific to a particular workflow management system (page 2, 1st paragraph, “the implementation...in operation, 2nd paragraph, ‘business processes that... they interoperate’”).

Regarding claims 11 and 12

Anderson et al teaches,

- receiving a high-level process definition (page 1, last paragraph, “this definition indicates the most...between organizations);
- converting the high-level process definition into a structured data and flow (page 2, 2nd paragraph, “business processes... they interoperate);

- automatically extracting at least one business-to-business (B2B) interaction point(page 2, 1st paragraph, “the implementation of value chain... in operation”). *Anderson et al teaches,* doesn’t teach explicitly generating a business-to-business (B2B) service template for the extracted interaction point. However *Work Group 1*, teaches (figure 2-1, page 7, item 2.1, 2nd paragraph, “it is the process definition... operation of the process”). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to generate template and use in workflow. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been

Art Unit: 2191

motivated to combine process description with process template in business-to-business environment along with standard to achieve efficiency and enhancing workflow management.

Regarding claim 17

Anderson et al teaches,

a structured process definition generator for receiving a description of a business-to-business interaction standard and responsive thereto for generating a structured business-to-business process definition (page 1, 2nd paragraph, “this definition indicates... between organization”);

a process template generator for automatically generating a business- to-business process template based on a structured business- to-business process definition (page 2, 1st paragraph, “the implementation of value chain... in operation”); and

Anderson et al teaches, doesn't teach explicitly a process template repository for storing the business-to-business process templates. However *Work Group 1*, teaches (figure 2-1, page 7, item 2.1, 2nd paragraph, “it is the process definition... operation of the process”). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to process template repository and use in workflow. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine process description with process template in business-to-business environment along with standard design work flow in E environment and provide uniformity with work flow.

Art Unit: 2191

Claims 8-10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Anderson et al* "Workflow Interoperability enabling E Commerce" April 1, 1999, www.wfmc.org is taken with A Common Object Model Discussion Paper (thereafter ACOMDP) Document no. WfMC-TC-1022, January 1998.

Regarding claims 8 and 18

Anderson et al teaches,

Workflow process and storing the process templates into a process template repository template in B2B environment and wherein the process templates are accessible to a workflow designer (page 2, 1st paragraph, "the implementation...in operation, 2nd paragraph, 'business processes that... they interoperate"). *Anderson et al* does not teach explicitly storing the service templates into a service template repository and wherein the service templates are accessible to a workflow designer. However, ACOMDP teaches, pages 14-15, see diagram on page 15, 1st paragraph, "various detailed component methods can be... above model"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate process repository and service repository. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine different kind of repositories in the process and services for faster and distributed workflow.

Regarding claim 9

ACOMPD teaches,

Retrieving a process template from the process template repository and adding at least one local service to the process template (see page 13, see diagram, item 5.2, 1st paragraph, additionally the WAPI interface...in the meta model").

Art Unit: 2191

Regarding claim 10

ACOMPD *teaches*,

Designing a process that includes a plurality of local service (page 13, see diagram, last paragraph, certain important characteristics...) and

Adding at least one interaction point service to the process (see page 14, see diagram, 1st paragraph, "sequential work item..." see item 5.3, "the additional component level...workflow manager functions").

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anil Khatri whose telephone number is 571-272-3725. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2191

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER